



U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, REGION II
Emergency and Remedial Response Division
Program Support Branch
290 Broadway, 18th Floor
New York, New York 10007-1866
212 -637-3258

MEMORANDUM

TO: Stephen Cipot, RPM

FROM: Rob Alvey, Geologist, TST

DATE: October 7, 2004

RE: **Response to Regulatory Comments on the Remedial Action Work Plan (RAWP)**
L.E. Carpenter Superfund Site, Wharton, NJ

I have read through the September 2004 "Response to Comments" submitted by RMT concerning the L.E. Carpenter site. I note that NJDEP has no comments on this submittal. The report addresses many issues, but does not fully clarify what action items will be conducted that have been approved by both EPA and NJDEP. Rather than continue to dwell on unresolved issues, I suggest that EPA provide enhanced oversight during the upcoming removal actions.

I have one concern that I need clarified. Page 4 of 10, Section II.2 states that the purpose of the pre-construction borings is to optimize the planning of excavation depths to the top of the smear zone. It is my understanding that excavation is planned to elevation 622, which is the lowest seasonal water table that has been observed, and hence, the expected bottom of a "smear zone". Unless there is a difference in handling of smear zone material versus overlying material, it would appear to be appropriate to extend these borings to the bottom of the smear zone.

Additional comments for future discussion

1. PCB delineation was approved by EPA and NJDEP based on a 1994 Weston report. Remedial action has not been implemented to date. Lead delineation was completed in 2001. LNAPL, while previously delineated was noted as a new surface water discharge during the second quarter 2004, and a previously undetected UST was also discovered in February 2004. Each of these items is evidence that the full extent of PCB may also need updating. Therefore, I recommend EPA reject RMT's statement (page 3 of 10) refusing to increase the vertical sampling frequency and side wall sampling for PCB-impacted soils. It is recognized that the RMT proposed excavation depth is very shallow, but since some of this area is wetlands, increased vertical sampling and side-wall sampling are critical.

2. "Clean Fill" (page 4 of 10) In addition to Lead, are any other constituents called for in determining if excavated material can be used as clean fill later in the project?

346515



3. It is noted that contingency plans for further action will only be contemplated after the free product removal action has been attempted. The excavation will also destroy many monitoring wells.
4. After removal activities, a new monitoring design will be proposed. Modeling is mentioned, but this will be a difficult task to agree on. Note that Page 7 of 10 (PRMP) states that RMT anticipates changing the previously approved MNA workplan, yet RMT already has concluded that MNA success is certain and will propose a ROD amendment in approximately 5 years.
5. EPA has not received the Wetlands Mitigation Plan (Page 7 of 10) which needs approval prior to implementing the removal action. ✓
6. Rockaway River Issues (Page 8 of 10). I suggest that "binding arbitration" or a strict time schedule be enforced so that the new site wide monitoring network be installed within 6 months of completion of the removal actions. This could drag on for years with RMT providing extensive excuses not to install a network to the satisfaction of EPA and NJDEP.
7. Page 10 of 10. RMT states an additional half acre "will be excavated down to the water table" to facilitate removal of both PCB and free product. This seems to conflict with previous descriptions to excavate through the smear zone.

cc: V. Pitruzzello
TST hydro